

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
SHERMAN DIVISION**

IN THE MATTER OF:

DILIP JANA
Plaintiff,

v.

WALMART, INC.,
Defendant.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Civil Action No. 4:24-cv-00698-SDJ-BD

[PROPOSED] ORDER ON PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR RECUSAL HON. BILL DAVIS

Before the Court is Plaintiff’s Motion for Recusal of Magistrate Judge Bill Davis (the “Motion”) pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 455(a) and 144, based on a documented appearance of partiality, unequal enforcement of procedural rules, and judicial reliance on false and procedurally improper representations submitted by Defendant Walmart Inc.

Having considered the Motion, the record, applicable law, and the controlling standards of judicial conduct, the Court finds that Plaintiff has demonstrated objective facts that would cause a reasonable person, fully informed of all circumstances, to question the impartiality of the presiding Magistrate Judge. See *Liljeberg v. Health Servs. Acquisition Corp.*, 486 U.S. 847, 864–65 (1988); *United States v. Jordan*, 49 F.3d 152, 155 (5th Cir. 1995).

Accordingly, the Court hereby **ORDERS** as follows:

1. Plaintiff's Motion for Recusal is **GRANTED**;
2. United States Magistrate Judge Bill Davis is **recused from all further proceedings** in this matter;
3. The Clerk is directed to **reassign all pending discovery and procedural matters** to an alternate United States Magistrate Judge or the presiding District Judge for further handling;
4. Any rulings previously entered by the recused Magistrate Judge, including Dkt. 66 and Dkt. 79, may be subject to further **review or reconsideration** upon motion by any party or sua sponte by the reassigned judicial officer;
5. The Court will consider **any further appropriate relief** necessary to preserve the appearance of fairness and safeguard the integrity of these proceedings.

SO ORDERED.